DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 404 EA 010 962

TITLE	Co-ordination of School and Community Facilities: Implications for Policies. Programme on Educational Building.
INSTITUTION	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris (France).
PUB DATE	May 78
NOTE	20p.; For a related document, see EA 010 963-964.
AVAILABLE FROM	OECD Publications Center, Suite 1207, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 (free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; *Community Services; *Coordination; Cross Cultural Studies; Elementary Secondary Education; Facility Planning; Facility Utilization Research; Foreign Countries; International Organizations; International Studies; *Neighborhood Centers; *Policy Formation; *School Buildings; School Community Relationship; *Shared Facilities

ABSTRACT

In 1975 and 1976, under the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Programme on Educational Building (PEB), a series of studies was undertaken on coordination of school and community facilities. A number of case studies were carried out in France, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States, countries in which numerous projects have been developed associating school buildings with facilities for other community services. An analysis of the case studies was aimed at showing the potential benefits of such projects and their specific implications for educational building policies, and the work culminated in an international symposium. This leaflet contains the main conclusions of this work, opening with a brief reminder of the way in which it developed and the type of results it has achieved, then summarizing the topics of the five-volume series now being published that presents the results of these studies. This is followed by a section on implications for policies formulated in policy terms that focus on the future and are concerned with what should be done to allow coordination of facilities to develop in the coming years. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162404

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

OECD

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) was set up under a Convention signed in Paris on 14th December 1960, which provides that the OECD shall promote policies designed:

- to achieve the highest sustainable economic growth and employment and a rising standard of living in Member countries, while maintaining financial stability, and thus to contribute to the development of the world economy;
- to contribute to sound economic expansion in Member as well as non-member countries in the process of economic development;
- to contribute to the expansion of world trade on a multilateral non-discriminatory basis in accordance with international obligations.

The Members of OECD are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is associated in certain work of the OECD, particularly that of the Programme on Educational Building.

The Programme on Educational Building (PEB) was established by the Council of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development as from January 1972. Its present mandate expires at the end of 1981.

The main objectives of the Programme are:

- to facilitate the exchange of information and experience on aspects of educational building judged to be important by participating Member countries;
- to promote co-operation between such Member countries regarding the technical bases for improving the quality, speed and cost effectiveness of school construction.

The Programme functions within the Directorate for Social Affairs, Manpower and Education of the Organisation in accordance with the decisions of the Council of the Organisation, under the authority of the Secretary-General. It is directed by a Steering Committee of senior government officials, and financed by participating governments.

© OECD, 1978
Queries concerning permissions or translation rights should be addressed to:
Director of Information, OECD
2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16, France.

FOREWORD

In 1975 and 1976, under the OECD Programme on Educational Building (PEB) a series of studies was undertaken on co-ordination of school and community facilities. A number of case studies were carried out in France, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States, countries in which numerous projects have been developed, since the end of the sixties, associating school buildings with facilities for other community services. The analysis of this country experience which was subsequently conducted by the Secretariat in consultation with a number of experts and the authorities of several countries, was aimed at showing the potential benefits of such projects and their specific implications for educational building policies. This work culminated in an international symposium (Skokloster, Sweden, September 1976) which provided the opportunity to supplement the analysis by bringing to bear on it the practical experience of people in the field (architects, urban planners, administrators, teachers and social workers). The present leaflet contains the main conclusions of this whole work. A brief reminder of the way in which it developed and the type of results it has achieved may help to clarify the significance and scope of this leaflet.

APPROACH ADOPTED FOR THE STUDIES ON CO-ORDINATION

The PEB Viewpoint

The activities of the Programme on Educational Building are related to those conducted by the other educational bodies of the OECD and the PEB studies on Co-ordination of School and Community Facilities were carried out in the more general context of relevant problems investigated by CERI (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation) and the Education Committee. Thus, under the heading of *School and Community*, CERI examined the possible benefits and risks involved for the school in any attempt to make wider use of the community's resources and to become more open to community needs. This study was continued by work on *Education and the Integration of Community Services* which analysed the problems entailed by the efforts of a number of countries to achieve a more co-ordinated approach to the organisation of social services, in which education plays a leading part. The OECD Education Committee conducted a series of studies on *Inter-sectoral Educational Planning* in an attempt to seek answers to the general question of how planning (and educational planning in particular) could take into account the interdependence of the different sectors of economic and social life.

Within this very broad context, the Programme on Educational Building has tackled the problem of co-ordination from its own specific viewpoint. The projects referred to above juxtapose or combine, in one and the same unit, buildings or facilities which are different, which have not traditionally been associated together and which are shared by users traditionally catered for by separate institutions. In these projects, co-ordination does of course imply much more than the simple physical juxtaposition or combination mentioned and also more than the mere joint use of the facilities. But through their respective characteristics, these buildings, the facilities they represent and the use made of them reflect decisions which not only concern their design, construction and management but which are also influenced by choices and constraints relating to the functions of the school, the social organisation of the

community, the use of public resources, urban planning etc. The broader implications of co-ordination were therefore likely to emerge from an analysis of these characteristics and these decisions. This was the viewpoint from which the studies undertaken by the Programme on Educational Building were carried out.

A Dynamic Study of Projects

A large number of problems are brought to light by co-ordinated facilities projects. What were the problems to which attention was primarily devoted? The first concerned the analysis of what can be observed i.e. the nature of the facilities and the way in which they are used. Overlap between certain types of accommodation provided in different facilities or the low frequency of their use suggest the possibility of sharing them or using them on a joint basis, but there are many obstacles to such shared use. How far can these obstacles be overcome and the most effective use made of the opportunities offered? What is the range of accommodation most suitable for this purpose? More generally, what are the implications of shared or joint use for the design and location of facilities and for their relation to the environment? What are the mechanisms and types of organisation which can best ensure the co-ordinated provision and operational management of facilities?

In the process of examining these questions, however, it rapidly emerged that the realities of a co-ordinated facilities project were richer and more complex than appeared at any particular time in the development of the project. It was therefore necessary to consider its dynamics, analyse its background and its capacity to meet whatever changes occur in the needs of the population catered for and in many other respects as well. From this point of view, study of the motivations behind co-ordination, providing as it does an insight into the origins of individual projects, began to assume particular importance. Motivations are often expressed in terms of expected benefits, i.e. the possibility of broadening the school's social role, dealing with interdependent social problems on an overall basis, developing the social environment in ways likely to promote communication and community identification, adjusting the decisions of national or regional planners to fit the details of local requirements, achieving economies in resources by using them more efficiently. However, these benefits can never be taken for granted and may always be counteracted by new developments in the projects themselves. It is important therefore to know what conditions need to be met to allow projects to develop in such a way that as many as possible of the expected benefits are realised.

Conditions for the Development of Projects

The way in which co-operation between the partners of a project is established, maintained and progresses depends on a number of conditions. The partners are numerous and they have different interests and concepts, they may not necessarily be trained or inclined to work in co-operation and may be subject to differing exigencies. Reconciling the interests and reducing the divergencies, therefore, depends not only on individual attitudes but also and, more particularly, on institutional arrangements which, for example, make it possible to harmonise existing norms for the financing, construction and operation of projects, or facilitate the re-allocation and sharing of responsibilities.

A second type of condition concerns the links which need to be established between various aspects of the implementation and development of projects. The design of the facilities, their location and spatial layout must be considered at the same time as the modes of operation envisaged.

A third condition relates to the needs of the population which the co-ordinated facilities are designed to serve differently and more fully than is generally the case with facilities provided separately. How can these needs be identified? How can they find expression? By what process and under what conditions can they be reflected in the architectural design and in the organisation of activities and the use of the buildings? Finally, how can changes in needs be kept under review and the facilities as well as the use made of them adapted or adjusted to meet these changes? In the course of its in-depth work on these questions PEB was led to emphasize two conditions which it is necessary to try to fulfill although this may not always be easy. The first concerns the need to allow potential or actual users to participate in

decisions concerning the design of the facilities and the way they are to be used. The second relates to the need for project evaluation which is seen less as an outside diagnosis and more as a continuous process forming an integral part of operation.

A final type of condition concerns the planning of facilities. In the projects studied, the co-ordination of the facilities had been planned on the scale of a very localised unit. But it soon emerged that to understand and handle such co-ordination efficiently it was impossible to stop short at this limited interpretation of planning. Indeed, the operation of a local project largely depends on the existence, in fairly close proximity, of other comparable and even competitive facilities, whether or not these are co-ordinated. The logic of co-ordination, which incidentally is confirmed by experience, therefore involves considering not only the relations between facilities in one and the same localised unit but also relations between that unit and other facilities over a fairly wide area, e.g. a large town or a small region.

RESULTS OF THE WORK

The results of these studies are now being published in a series of five volumes under the general title of ***Building for School and Community***. For reasons which it is easy to understand this series is appearing in reverse order to that of the actual work: the first volume presents the synthesis and main conclusions whereas the subsequent volumes contain the case studies which were used as a basis for this synthesis and therefore illustrate it.

A COMPREHENSIVE STUDY

Volume I: POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

This volume is a condensation of the approach described above and demonstrates its continuity. The first report, ***Inter-sectoral Issues*** by Thierry Malan, gives an overall view of one of the main aspects of analysis of the various cases, i.e. the motivations behind co-ordination. It shows how co-ordination of facilities can be considered as a specific expression of broader tendencies, characteristic of industrialised societies. The second report, ***A Synthesis in the Light of International Experience,*** draws lessons from the case studies in terms which are sufficiently general to be used by decision-makers in widely different countries and thus suggests answers to many of the questions raised above. To make the conclusions more accessible, various aspects are abundantly illustrated by graphs and diagrams, i.e. range of co-ordinated facilities and types of combinations, models of financing and of operational co-ordination, scale of projects and systems of project development etc. The volume closes with the ***Report on the Skokloster Symposium*** which, under the title of ***Tasks and Mechanisms*** outlines the operational proposals made by participants at this Symposium. Because of the direct involvement of the participants in facilities co-ordination, the report offers as it were an "inside view" of the problems which arise in implementing such co-ordination.

COUNTRY STUDIES

The case studies are presented in the subsequent volumes, each devoted to a particular country. These volumes, therefore, have a number of common characteristics. The case study itself constitutes the essential part but a distinction has been made between the actual description of the case which provides the detailed information on it and the comments of the observers which focus on the problems of co-ordination as they arise in the case concerned. Associated with each case study are a few supplementary

papers or reports, the first of which is invariably a brief analysis of the national context and trends with regard to co-ordination. It will therefore suffice here to indicate what is specific to each of the volumes.

Volume II: FRANCE

This volume centres around the study on the *Centre Educatif et Culturel d'Istres,* one of the first co-ordinated projects of this type built in France, giving concrete form to the concept of " integrated facilities" as it prevailed in France in the early 70s. In addition to the *Context and Trends* paper, the study is supplemented by a presentation of the method used to co-ordinate facilities in a New Town and integrate them into their environment. Under the title *Location of School and Community Facilities in a New Residential Area : the Case of Evry I* a description will be found of the main steps taken by the urban planners responsible as well as a sample of the proposals to which these steps ultimately led.

Volume III: UNITED STATES

The principal report in this volume is not strictly speaking a case study report. In the United States decentralisation of decision-making and the extensive autonomy enjoyed by local education authorities result in a wide range of projects and practices. To reflect this diversity and the rapid rate of change in this country the several cases examined are presented—under the title *From Individual projects Towards City-Wide Networks*—in ways which emphasize their contrast. The study therefore deals not only with the large and well-known complexes, characteristic of the end of the 60s and the beginning of the 70s—presented in the form of a comparative evaluation of their current situation—but also includes an analysis of new trends: re-use of empty schools for community purposes; co-ordination of dispersed facilities; situations originating from different development models—on the one hand organic or spontaneous growth and, on the other, the planning or interventionist approach; projects where the scales for the co-ordination of educational resources are different—big cities or small neighbourhoods. In the other major report contained in this volume, i.e. *User Participation in Planning and Design,* David Lewis, an American architect and urban planner, author of a large number of co-ordinated facility projects, outlines his concepts and method. Referring to projects in which he has developed this method, he examines the conditions under which user participation develops and provides information on the techniques applied to promote such participation and make it effective.

Volume IV: ENGLAND, AUSTRALIA

If these two countries have been brought together in the same volume it is essentially because of a community of ideas; but in addition since no case study was undertaken in Australia, it was felt that despite the value of Australian experience in this area the material gathered was insufficient to justify a separate volume. In Volume IV the national context study on England is more than just a supplementary paper. *Facilities for Education and Other Public Purposes in England and Wales* is more of a substantial introduction without which the information contained in the succeeding reports might appear incomplete. English experience, which is based on a long tradition of autonomous local authorities, is likewise diversified and the introduction examines, amongst other factors, the different forms which facilities co-ordination take in England.

Two projects are then presented, i.e. *Yateley School and Community Centre,* which is considered in detail and *Crew Central Area Project,* the description of which is more condensed. They illustrate two extreme trends. One reflects a situation frequently encountered in which co-ordination develops empirically with the facilities and the use made of them while the other illustrates a new approach to co-ordination in the form of a network of facilities combining old and new buildings as part of the renovation of an old city centre.

The last report *Recent Developments in Australia* shows how specific solutions, transcending the influence of British models, have been evolved in a particular context.

Volume IV: SWEDEN

This volume contains a larger number of papers or reports than the previous ones even if it centres on developments in one and the same region i.e. the Göteborg conurbation. It thus reflects a number of different approaches to co-ordination. One is descriptive and studies the case of *Rannebergen Centrum, Göteborg,* a characteristic example of the way in which the problems of new housing estates in the periphery of a city are being handled. Another examines the general problems of facilities planning in a big city, *Policies for the Provision of Facilities in the Development of the City of Göteborg.* The third report is more methodological and describes how the lessons learnt from previous experiences were applied to a new project, Planning Process of the Co-ordinated Centre of Västra Frölunda, Göteborg. In addition to a note on the national context, the three main reports are supplemented by an illustration of projects of a different type.

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICIES

The paper which follows should not be read as a digest of the results outlined above. It is the outcome of the decision by the Steering Committee of the Programme to single out and re-state certain of the conclusions which could be drawn from the work done, as an expression of its own viewpoint on the problems of facilities co-ordination. Whereas the studies and reports were made at the request of the Committee, the conclusions set forth below constitute a statement by the Committee itself and consequently this statement alone involves the Committee's responsibility. It was adopted by the Committee at its December 1977 Session.

The main feature of this statement is that the conclusions it contains are formulated in policy terms. This means, first of all, that it focuses on the future and is concerned with what should be done to allow co-ordination of facilities to develop in the coming years. It also means that, without prescribing any precise recommendations (for this would go beyond the Committee's scope), the statement suggests guidelines for action or, more precisely, types of measures to be taken by those responsible for the provision of facilities.

Such measures naturally depend on the prevailing situation and the options made by the people involved and those referred to in the statement cannot therefore be regarded as mandatory. To allow for the necessary freedom of choice which the authorities in each country must enjoy, the conclusions have been presented at three different levels. The level of conclusions likely to concern a particular authority will depend on whether it still hesitates to commit itself to co-ordination or whether it is prepared to carry the co-ordination of facilities still further.

At the first level the initial three conclusions deal with ways of meeting the problems most countries are facing or are likely to face. These conclusions do not necessarily imply recourse to solutions entailing facilities co-ordination. However, the arguments leading up to them indicate the potential benefits of such solutions.

At the second level the four ensuing conclusions concern measures to be taken in cases where it has been decided to promote and support the development of co-ordinated facilities projects without necessarily making them the general rule.

At the third level the last three conclusions concern the generalisation of facilities co-ordination in a given region or country. Where this is not the option taken, the conclusions may nevertheless offer medium or long-term prospects.

INTRODUCTION

Exchange between schools and other community facilities has for long been a fairly widespread practice in many countries; for example, sports facilities are used both by pupils and other members of the community, museums and theatres are open to school activities and schools to adult education activities. However, in several countries, the frequency and nature of these relationships have changed significantly during the last decade. Building projects have been specially designed to develop such relationships; school buildings have been associated with or sometimes integrated into facilities intended for other community functions and services, and a number of activities of different types are thus accommodated within the same physical setting. In such co-ordinated school and community facilities projects, the physical co-ordination which is reflected in the layout of the buildings results from new design and planning processes; it involves or presupposes a co-ordination of activities which demands new modes of management and operation. Since the function of facilities is to provide a community with the services it requires to meet social needs—education, leisure, medical and social services etc.—co-ordination of facilities generally implies co-ordination of the services they accommodate and co-operation between the agencies, administrations or institutions organising these services. Then finally, the question arises as to whether the services or activities fit the needs of the community and whether the facilities accommodating them are adequate; other aspects of co-ordination must therefore be considered, concerning on the one hand the relations between the institutions, administrations, agencies and the community itself and, on the other, the relations between the facilities and their environment. In co-ordinated facilities projects, these various aspects of co-ordination are interdependent. The principal aspect and focus of interest in terms of school building is the physical co-ordination of facilities but, especially when policies are under consideration, this aspect must be looked at in relation to all other aspects of co-ordination.

Although the number of co-ordinated facilities projects varies according to countries and may be very high in some, nowhere do they seem to represent a majority phenomenon: co-ordination of school and community facilities is very rarely a general practice but rather an exception to the rule. However, co-ordinated facilities projects, whether built or under way, reflect trends and directions which are far more important than might be inferred from their limited number. This is why it has seemed necessary to clarify the significance of these trends and such indications as they may offer for the development of future policies regarding buildings for community purposes and school buildings in particular.

The various forms in which co-ordination of facilities occurs stem largely from the contexts in which they have been developed; there is therefore no general model for such co-ordination nor for solving the new problems which school building policies will have to face in the years to come. Co-ordination in whatever form it occurs, may however be regarded as indicative of these problems and of possible ways to tackle them. As the Steering Committee of the Programme has already underlined "educational building can no longer be considered in isolation"[1]; it is necessary, therefore, to examine the relationships of educational building with its environment and with the other elements constituting the wider system of educational and social facilities of which it forms part. Co-ordinated facilities projects can thus be considered as ways and means of facing this new situation against the reality of concrete circumstances.

1. *Information Leaflet No. 9*, "Educational Building: Policies and Co-operation", Programme on Educational Building, OECD, Paris, April 1977.

Co-ordination is not an end in itself but a means of achieving a set of specific objectives. If all co-ordinated facilities projects do not achieve their objectives or produce convincing results, this does not necessarily prove that the principle of co-ordination is in itself weak. It may rather point to the limited experience on the part of their promoters and to difficulties arising from the economic, social or institutional context of the projects. Thus, co-ordination of school and community facilities makes sense only if reference is made to the conditions which either favour it or make it difficult, to the price of obtaining maximum benefits from it, and to the practices and strategies required for its implementation.

PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL BUILDING IN THE FUTURE

By proposing new ways of designing, constructing and using public buildings, co-ordinated facilities projects attempt to meet needs and demands that traditional solutions seem unable to satisfy. Although these needs emerge in particular situations, they are general in nature to the extent that they are generated by changes which in modern societies affect the relations both between school and community and between the various institutions—the school included—which serve the community or operate within it. It cannot be maintained that facilities co-ordination constitutes the only possible answer, nor the best, to the problems which this twofold evolution raises. On the other hand, the question must be asked to what extent the problems which confront co-ordination are not among those that all school building policies will have to face up to, in the future, and thus are inescapable.

The demands which people are now making on the school, while not refuting the importance of its specifically educational function, go increasingly beyond it. The school is expected for example to increase its social role, to contribute to the revival of regional cultures or to help the most disadvantaged communities to fulfil their aspirations. In addition, it is increasingly acknowledged that differing social needs and problems are closely bound up with each other and that social inequality or segregation can be reduced only by wide-ranging measures. Traditional practice, however, splits needs and services up into rigidly defined sectors and the isolation of the corresponding facilities reflects and reinforces this sectorisation. It therefore seems necessary to permit exchanges and co-operation between the various facilities so that both the interdependence and number of services rendered may be increased. Thus, the school, as a building, no longer ought to be a preserve intended for a specific purpose, education, but should accommodate other activities also; the same applies to other facilities than the school. Nor should any facility of this kind—especially the school—be conceived or used without account being taken of other facilities, planned or existing, in its neighbourhood, and of the possibilities that each can offer the others.

Demands regarding quality of life are also changing and becoming more pressing. As a result of the continuous development of urban life, not only are demands on public services growing and becoming more diversified, but the nature of them is changing also. The public insists, and will do so even more in the future, that the places where people live develop into harmonious and balanced environments in which functions are no longer rigidly separated and where possibilities of communication are increased. Community facilities should conduce more effectively than is the case today to improving the quality of life. They should, therefore, through their location and form fit into the environment in such a way as to contribute more effectively to social communication and the "animation" of urban life. This applies particularly to the school, which plays, as it does, such an important role in the life of the community.

CONCLUSION I. School building policies can no longer be defined in isolation. Whilst such policies will continue to be geared towards their own specific requirements, they will have to take into account the need for co-operation with other building policies that aim to satisfy both the overall needs of various communities and their demand for a better living environment. School building policies need to be considered as elements, not only of educational policies, but also of

inter-sectoral policies. In those countries where inter-sectoral policies do not exist or lack precision, the authorities responsible for school building ought to contribute to making people aware of the importance of greater inter-sectoralism in the definition of new educational policies.

The growing and increasingly differentiated demand for services requires a greater number of more diversified facilities, and equipping a community with all the facilities it would need raises problems of costs and optimum use of resources. At the same time, experience shows that the use of existing facilities is not as wide as it could be and that there is duplication of comparable accommodation in different facilities. Furthermore, and particularly in urban areas it is hardly possible, for reasons of cost and the lack of well-situated sites, to allow all facilities to be suitably located. In order to overcome these difficulties, the authorities responsible for the planning, construction and use of facilities will have to act in concert. Co-ordination of investments, as well as co-ordinated use of accommodation, may also allow greater benefits to be obtained for the same capital outlay than if the various partners were to invest separately.

If the facilities are continuously to meet the needs of a live community, changes are to be expected in the activities accommodated and in the kind and number of people using the facilities. However, the consequent adaptations are costly and often technically difficult. The authorities concerned therefore ought to consider whether these difficulties are not more easily overcome when accommodation which has become redundant in relation to its initial function (completely or partly empy schools, for example) can be used for other purposes. If all the facilities serving a community were considered as a single range of diversified accommodation, would not a system of exchanges and joint use provide sufficient flexibility to allow the necessary adaptations to be made at less cost and more rapidly?

CONCLUSION II. Measures need to be taken and the necessary "administrative reflexes" created so that each proposal to build a school is carefully examined to see what relationships it might have with other facilities; so that any educational building project or any other social building project is seen as an opportunity and focus for discussing the totality of social needs in the locality; so that the investments of various public services may be co-ordinated at local level or reciprocally adjusted; and so that existing buildings, no matter which agency they may "belong" to, may be used for serving in the best possible way the overall needs of the community.

The changes referred to above are part of more far-reaching changes in the social and material organisation of human groups. These changes are governed by economic and social forces which planning attempts to direct. But the changes are so interdependent and of such a kind that facilities planning can no longer remain sectorised, i.e. be undertaken independently by each agency or administration concerned. It is acknowledged today that efficient planning demands co-operation between sectors. Inter-sectoral planning, like all planning, can only be carried out at the level of regions or large cities while its impact on individuals or groups is felt at the local level. Similarly, planning decisions dependent on long-term objectives take so long to implement that changes which have occurred in the meantime further widen the gap between intention and result. It is therefore necessary—and this in no way challenges the value of macro-level planning decisions—to undertake a further complementary function, a "fine-tuning" function, discharged at local level, of adjusting such macro-decisions to detailed needs so as to forestall or reduce the disparities which are likely to emerge. Co-ordinated facilities projects, rooted as they are in local communities, constitute good examples of mechanisms discharging such a function.

CONCLUSION III. Measures need to be taken to ensure that the planning of school buildings is carried out in concert with the planning of facilities for other social sectors. To the greatest possible extent, inter-sectoral mechanisms for facilities planning should be established. These mechanisms would need to operate at regional level in order to ensure the liaison between the central level where the broad policies are developed, and the local level where the problems of adjustment come to the fore. For this liaison to be effective, these mechanisms need to be supplemented by co-operation at the local level between the agencies concerned as well as between these and the community.

The three preceding conclusions are general in scope and, although they are derived from the lessons learnt from co-ordination of school and community facilities, they do not necessarily entail recourse to such co-ordination for their application in practice. As regards co-ordination of facilities the experience of various OECD Member countries varies considerably. Some have already travelled a fairly long distance on the road to co-ordination whereas others have not decided yet whether to set out. The decision by countries to continue on this road or to take it is dependent upon choices that cannot be prejudged. However, the number of countries that are interested in this prospect is sufficiently large for it to be worthwhile to analyse under what conditions co-ordination of facilities, without necessarily becoming a general rule, can be initiated or pursued. In this lies the relevance of the conclusions that follow.

One of the fundamental features of co-ordinated facilities undertakings is that they presuppose a voluntary engagement by the various partners. These partners are, on the one hand, the official agencies responsible for the provision of facilities, for their financing and use and, on the other, the associations, groups and individuals whose needs the facilities are to satisfy and who will be the users. When local initiative plays the prime role in co-ordinated undertakings, the chances are greater that the facilities will meet the actual needs of the community. Although theoretically co-ordination may be imposed from the outside, its potential benefits seem to be more easily realised when the various partners, for practical or ideological reasons, are willing to co-operate. Careful consideration should therefore be given to the means by which members of the community, wherever possible, can take an active part in decision-making, and authorities will do better to proceed by incentive rather than by regulation to encourage such initiative and co-operation.

Co-ordinated undertakings also face many uncertainties. First, even if the commitment of some of the partners is practically irreversible, the partnership is nonetheless subject to unpredictable fluctuation. Then, too, the evolution of the interests and needs of the community results in similarly unpredictable fluctuations of the clientele of co-ordinated facilities, in changes of activity and in transfers of functions of accommodation. These uncertainties do not in themselves constitute a weakness of co-ordinated undertakings; but they imply that such undertakings never reach a stage of completion or a definitive pattern of operation and that they must be conceived of as always open to change. In order to enable co-ordinated facilities to respond to such changes, their design and pattern of use must allow for the necessary flexibility; those in charge must pay continuous attention to needs as they change and reconsider or adjust their methods of co-operating in the use of the accommodation.

The uncertainties may however entail risks of discord. These risks essentially arise from practical issues concerning the use and management of the facilities and from difficulties encountered by different groups of staff when they have to work together in unfamiliar circumstances. Thus by their very nature, co-ordinated undertakings seem to be vulnerable. When they emerge as exceptions to the general rule, their vulnerability is further increased by the pressure of the system governing the "normal" use of facilities. To reduce this vulnerability the authorities at various levels need to take measures, each within their own field of competence, to keep everyone concerned with facilities problems as widely informed as possible, to specify the possible terms of partnership agreements, to modify regulations and the ways of implementing them in order to allay fears and reservations, to train the staff concerned and make them participate in the planning of the projects.

CONCLUSION IV. For co-ordinated facilities undertakings to develop it is necessary to promote or increase the power of initiative of communities and agencies at local level. Suitable incentives need to be provided by central or regional authorities and support measures developed. At the level of the projects themselves, provision should be made for concerted and continuous study of needs. At regional or central level advisory, inter-agency mechanisms should be established with the task of working out model agreements for projects, studying the particular difficulties that co-ordination raises and proposing any modifications to regulations, norms and legislation needed in support of co-ordination. Central or regional authorities also need to provide special training for the staff of co-ordinated facilities projects.

What has just been said shows the importance of management arrangements and structures for ensuring the stability of projects. Experience also shows that many difficulties in co-ordination are realised too late to be overcome, either because the operational arrangements necessary have been too little thought about beforehand, or because of failure to foresee how and by whom the responsibilities implicit in them should be discharged. Finally, there is a very close relationship between the operation of projects and the design of accommodation. Unless this relationship is considered from the very first stages of design, difficulties will arise in ensuring the best possible use of the facilities, especially since they will have to accommodate changes in activity and fluctuations in clientele.

Managerial tasks of co-ordinated projects occur at the tactical level of day-to-day decisions about the use of accommodation, scheduling of activities, maintenance and security. They occur also, however, at the strategic level where decisions have to dispose of outcomes that are unexpected or unwelcome, take into account new needs that emerge from experience, establish or revise priorities and cover the negotiations that are needed to obtain the means of implementing the priorities thus set.

If management structures are to ensure operational effectiveness, these two types of task need to be kept distinct from each other. This implies that two management groups need to operate at different levels, one dealing with strategies and the other concerned with tactical management. Efficient and flexible relations must also be established between these two levels; this might be achieved through a co-ordinator whose commitment and personal qualities should correspond to his important functions of facilitating co-ordination, if not of providing a driving force towards it. Finally, the community needs to be effectively represented at the first level of responsibility if it is to make its voice heard and contribute to overall policy decisions; likewise, at the second level, users should have an active part in putting these decisions into effect in the daily operation of the facilities.

CONCLUSION V. While allowing a certain flexibility for future developments, clear agreements between partners in co-ordinated facilities projects, together with suitable management structures, need to be worked out from the moment the decision is taken to launch the projects. Such management structures should make a clear distinction between strategic and tactical responsibilities as well as between the two corresponding levels of decision-making.

In the management of co-ordinated projects, questions of finance are even more important than in ordinary projects, notably by reason of the difficult need to co-ordinate expenditure and to ensure that recurrent costs are equitably shared. The cost-sharing principle adopted should be such as will not only encourage the development of joint use of the facilities—rather than discourage it, as sometimes can happen—but will also allow patterns of use to change as the needs and interests of the community change. In other words, it must enable the management of the co-ordinated facilities to be for the benefit of all without detriment to any partner.

These prior agreements on cost-sharing presuppose that the management structure not only has financial resources at its disposal but also enjoys sufficient autonomy in deciding on their use. Such autonomy may be at variance with general regulations or with the powers that separate administrations exercise over their agencies or services. It is thus up to the authorities at a level above that of the projects to consider modifications to such regulations or a relaxation of the powers exercised. The necessary corollary to this is, of course, that expenditure control can be made more precise. But it is essential that other criteria and methods than those used for non co-ordinated projects govern such control so that the costs can be related to the services in fact rendered.

However, questions of finance first present themselves in investment terms when the projects are to be launched and planned. Funds from numerous sources—public or quasi-public and even private—must be brought together. Funds from different sources are often subject to different norms and their allocation governed by different procedures. It may also happen that they are not available at the same time. Finally, further difficulties arise from inequalities in the resources available to the various partners and this may upset relations between them in the co-operative venture. To overcome these difficulties it seems necessary to resort, if not to a pooling of obtainable funds (which may not always be

possible), at least to some sort of mechanism which can act as a single go-between on behalf of all investors and take direct or indirect responsibility for the use made of the funds during design and construction. This mechanism also needs to enjoy a certain autonomy, with community representatives participating in its decisions. It needs global sums at its disposal and to be empowered to spend them in such a way that the requirements of the agencies are reconciled with the logic of the project. Expenditure control is all the more important; it must allow each partner to know how its own contribution has been spend and at the same time show what value has been obtained by all partners in return.

CONCLUSION VI. To allow the development of co-ordinated undertakings, it is necessary to ensure co-ordination of financing not only for their operation but also during planning and design. Measures need to be taken to ensure that management structures and those in charge of planning and design enjoy sufficient autonomy with global sums at their disposal. At the project level, it is important that public officials should be in a position to apply regulations flexibly in support of co-ordination; at a higher level, the authorities need to harmonise the norms and procedures of various service sectors, devise co-ordinated financing procedures and develop new methods of expenditure control.

The design of co-ordinated facilities, in turn, demands special methods and procedures the further development of which needs to be encouraged if ventures in co-ordination are to have increased chances of success. First of all, since more people with more varied backgrounds are involved in the design process than is the case in the design of traditional projects, the design dialogue needs to be enlarged. The architects, officials of the agencies involved and future "animateurs" of activities to be accommodated are more numerous and their views and interests spread more widely than when, for example, only a school is concerned. In addition, the design dialogue must also be extended to community groups and interests. Such wide participation in the dialogue requires the appointment of a co-ordinator to facilitate the link between those who express the demands on the one hand and, on the other, the professionals and specialists who try to meet them.

The design of co-ordinated facilities must begin with an exploratory phase during which not only the needs of potential users are identified but also the users themselves and the partners likely to become associated in the project. The amount of the financial resources that can be obtained also needs to be determined, other available resources identified, especially existing buildings, while ideas must also be collected from people who have thought about possible uses for them. It is at this stage, too, that the agreements between partners and the modes of operation envisaged must be worked out.

The second phase in the design process consists of developing the "programme" which is implied by the needs the physical accommodation must meet. This is to be seen as a new kind of negotiation between partners which aims to specify the commitments entered, the financial arrangements and the intended method of operation. It is at this stage that the ideas must be expressed which the search for the best solution stimulates and transforms into concrete proposals. The study of the community's needs must continue during this phase—needs which tend to be increasingly clarified as proposals and counter-proposals for meeting them are advanced and discussed. It is by such means that the types of activities envisaged and the current types of accommodation corresponding to them are specified. Possible duplication and overlap between activities and between items of accommodation then have to be identified and new types of accommodation define which can help to increase the number of activities accommodated and meet the particular needs which their co-ordination implies. More important still is the determination of the inter-relationships between all the various items of accommodation.

CONCLUSION VII. If co-ordinated undertakings are to develop with the greatest chances of success, their design must be based on an exploration of the needs of the community and be developed as a mutual negotiation and learning process between partners. To this end, it is necessary to ensure that sufficient time is allowed between the decision to launch projects and the date when they are to start functioning. Design groups must also be set up associating professionals—architects, officials, teachers and other staff—and community representatives, with a co-ordinator as the driving force.

FROM CO-ORDINATION OF INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS TO POLICIES FOR THE GENERALISED CO-ORDINATION OF FACILITIES

The preceding conclusions regarding the development of co-ordinated facilities projects, correspond, it would appear, to the situation in the vast majority of countries where problems of facilities co-ordination occur. But it is quite as probable that some countries are asking—or will ask themselves in the near future—whether co-ordinated undertakings should not only be encouraged and supported but even adopted as the general rule. This would mean moving towards policies for the generalised co-ordination of facilities. Such policies imply a coherent set of measures, legal arrangements or regulations which apply to all community facilities, together with special mechanisms and procedures for their implementation. The following conclusions concern the main aspects of such an evolution.

A first issue concerns the scale on which it seems desirable to deal with the problems of facilities co-ordination. On the one hand, it seems indispensable to do so in relation to communities which are small and coherent enough for the needs to be properly assessed, for getting community groups and interests really involved and for effectively overcoming the difficulties inherent in co-ordination. But, on the other hand, the development of modern urban life and the changes which characterise it render the coherence of such communities uncertain and underline how far various local communities are, in fact, interdependent, and therefore need to be integrated into a greater whole. The interlinking of community facilities and their immediate neighbourhood therefore needs to be reconciled with the planning of all the facilities serving zones big enough to ensure more exchanges and greater mutual support between the different communities, together with a better balance of opportunities open to each of them.

It is, in fact, difficult to determine what particular locality a given set of co-ordinated facilities serves or should serve. Each facility in a given set has its own particular zone of influence depending on its ease of access, on what kind of population it attracts and on the proximity of competing facilities. Furthermore, these three factors are interdependent and subject to continuous change. In order to control them as well as possible it is necessary to plan the relationships which sets of co-ordinated facilities should have with each other, as well as with the non-co-ordinated facilities in a given geographical area.

In countries where local authorities enjoy a large degree of autonomy, special mechanisms are needed to undertake this planning; the clienteles served by co-ordinated facilities are often drawn from areas outside the boundaries of their particular local authority and it is therefore in the interest of neighbouring authorities to co-operate in order to avoid gaps or costly overlaps in serving the populations concerned. Such mechanisms are all the more necessary in countries where local authorities are more dependent on higher levels of government; the latter have an interest in ensuring a certain balance between communities as a result of resource distribution and in seeing to it that resources are judiciously used. These mechanisms should assume forecasting and investigatory functions, establish priorities for the further evolution of sets of facilities and co-ordinate financial inputs.

> *CONCLUSION VIII. If it is considered desirable that co-ordination of facilities becomes the general rule, the relationships between sets of co-ordinated facilities intended for local communities need to be planned, at the scale of regions. Such planning should be carried out, at a level between that of the local community and the central authorities, and should be entrusted to mechanisms that have the necessary means and powers to carry it out. These mechanisms should comprise not just specialists, but also representatives of the managers, designers and users of the projects which are built or planned.*

A co-ordination policy which seeks to stimulate local initiatives and at the same time harmonise them with the whole of the community in the widest sense, must find the means of getting to know and of making known the benefits that can be expected from co-ordination, the difficulties inherent in its implementation and possible ways of overcoming them. The information function is thus paramount and can only be effectively undertaken at an upper level of responsibility; but it can be efficiently performed only if it is paralleled by research and evaluation of experience gained, and if mechanisms are established

for making the information available at local level where it is most needed. Methods of evaluating experience then need to be defined with the specific objectives of co-ordination in mind and must adopt as an essential criterion the number and quality of services rendered to the community.

Research and evaluation will however not suffice as a basis for determining the best solutions and for suggesting appropriate strategic decisions. They must be complemented by a development policy. Nor will it be sufficient to organise such development work as a process going from one type of project to the next: each project needs to be seen as constituting a development project in itself, in the sense that change and development are among its inherent characteristics. This is why the internal evaluation of co-ordinated facilities undertakings is even more important than the external evaluation of projects referred to above.

CONCLUSION IX. If it is considered desirable to promote policies for co-ordinating facilities, the functions of research, development and information on problems of co-ordination need to be undertaken. To this end, research in this field needs to be organised at central level, an inter-sectoral advisory service must function at central, regional and local levels and finally, at the level of each project, internal evaluation is also needed.

There is no doubt that moving towards a policy of facilities co-ordination changes the distribution of decision-making powers as regards facilities. The importance which is attached to the expression of public opinion in each co-ordinated undertaking implies that a co-ordination policy should encourage such expression and provide for participation by community groups and interests. But such participation is not without difficulties or risks and authorities at the higher levels will no doubt be sensitive to the price in terms of time and expense it entails and will assert their responsibilities in controlling the use of the resources they make available and in safeguarding the general interests of the community at large. Nevertheless, they will have to search for solutions which make it possible to reconcile their own needs with the equally pressing necessity of ensuring that individuals and groups from the local community take a large part in decisions about the provision and use of facilities intended for them.

Other changes also need to be made in the way powers and responsibilities are distributed between the various agencies concerned with co-ordinated facilities. Happily, experience shows that the partners in any co-ordinated undertaking tend to federate. In order to move towards a more generalised policy, this trend ought to be encouraged and consolidated by creating a permanent mechanism for co-ordination which will allow the several partners to merge some of their activities and resources, and by giving to this federation adequate autonomy in relation to the usual service sectors, whose powers could with advantage be reduced.

These changes in the distribution of powers in turn imply the need to remove such obstacles which regulations and laws impose on facilities co-ordination. It may also prove essential to modify, with a view to harmonising them, the responsibilities which, according to the kind of facilities concerned, are exercised at different levels. Finally, a policy for facilities co-ordination will need to review how resources are distributed between communities and between official agencies, and considerably increase the possibilities of redistributing existing resources, by for example facilitating transfers of ownership. In many cases, all these modifications can be decided only at the highest level of authority. They therefore need the closest attention at this level, and measures are needed to make the revision of norms and legal arrangements a continuous process.

CONCLUSION X. If facilities co-ordination is to become a general policy, measures are needed to ensure the widest possible exercise of local powers of decision in matters of facilities. It is equally necessary that transfers of responsibility and powers between agencies should become possible. At the level of central or regional authorities, some mechanism must provide for the federation of sectoral powers and suggest necessary adjustments to legal and institutional arrangements needed to ensure the development of co-ordination.

LIST OF PEB PUBLICATIONS AND LEAFLETS

PUBLICATIONS

SCHOOL BUILDING AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE (Pearson, E.), OECD, Paris, 1975
(60 pages) £1.30 $3.25 F13,00

BUILDING IMPLICATIONS OF THE MULTI-OPTION SCHOOL (Ader, J.), OECD, Paris, 1975
(112 pages) £3.60 $9.00 F36,00

INDUSTRIALISED BUILDING FOR SCHOOLS (Oddie, G.B.), OECD, Paris, 1975
(78 pages) £2.30 $5.25 F21,00

PROVIDING FOR FUTURE CHANGE — ADAPTABILITY AND FLEXIBILITY IN SCHOOL BUILDING, OECD, Paris, 1976
(112 pages) £3.00 $7.00 F28,00

Available from OECD Sales Agents (see list on page 19)

INFORMATION LEAFLETS

(available from the PEB Secretariat, OECD, Paris)

1. School Building Today and Tomorrow, 1973
2. Maiden Erlegh : An English Secondary School Development Project (Booth, C.), 1973
3. C.R.O.C.S.: A Swiss Industrialised School Building System (Lenssen, P.), 1973
4. ff5: A Canadian "Casework" or Furniture and Equipment System for Schools (Lenssen, P.), 1974
5. Industrialised Building Systems, Educational Objectives and the Problem of Change (Phillips, C.W.), 1974
6. Institutional Arrangements for School Building (Lindsay, N.), 1975
7. Teachers and School Building (Rhode, B.), 1976
8. Den Helder: A Dutch Secondary School Development Project (Geursen, T.), to be issued
9. Educational Building: Policies and Co-operation, 1977
10. Co-ordination of School and Community Facilities: Implications for Policies, 1978.

OECD SALES AGENTS
DÉPOSITAIRES DES PUBLICATIONS DE L'OCDE

ARGENTINA – ARGENTINE
Carlos Hirsch S.R.L., Florida 165,
BUENOS-AIRES. ☎33-1787-2391 Y 30-7122

AUSTRALIA – AUSTRALIE
International B.C.N. Library Suppliers Pty Ltd.,
161 Sturt St., South MELBOURNE, Vic. 3205. ☎699-6388
P.O.Box 202, COLLAROY, NSW 2097 ☎982 4515

AUSTRIA – AUTRICHE
Gerold and Co., Graben 31, WIEN 1. ☎52.22.35

BELGIUM – BELGIQUE
Librairie des Sciences,
Coudenberg 76-78, B 1000 BRUXELLES 1. ☎512-05-60

BRAZIL – BRÉSIL
Mestre Jou S.A., Rua Guaipà 518,
Caixa Postal 24090, 05089 SAO PAULO 10. ☎261-1920
Rua Senador Dantas 19 s/205-6, RIO DE JANEIRO GB.
☎232-07. 32

CANADA
Renouf Publishing Company Limited,
2182 St. Catherine Street West,
MONTREAL, Quebec H3H 1M7 ☎(514) 937-3519

DENMARK – DANEMARK
Munksgaards Boghandel,
Nørregade 6, 1165 KØBENHAVN K. ☎(01) 12 69 70

FINLAND – FINLANDE
Akateeminen Kirjakauppa
Keskuskatu 1, 00100 HELSINKI 10. ☎625.901

FRANCE
Bureau des Publications de l'OCDE,
2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16.
☎524.81.67
Principal correspondant :
13602 AIX-EN-PROVENCE : Librairie de l'Université.
☎26.18.08

GERMANY – ALLEMAGNE
Verlag Weltarchiv G.m.b.H.
D 2000 HAMBURG 36, Neuer Jungfernstieg 21.
☎040-35-62-500

GREECE – GRÈCE
Librairie Kauffmann, 28 rue du Stade,
ATHÈNES 132. ☎322.21.60

HONG-KONG
Government Information Services,
Sales and Publications Office, Beaconsfield House, 1st floor,
Queen's Road, Central. ☎H-233191

ICELAND – ISLANDE
Snaebjörn Jónsson and Co., h.f.,
Hafnarstraeti 4 and 9, P.O.B. 1131, REYKJAVIC.
☎13133/14281/11936

INDIA – INDE
Oxford Book and Stationery Co.:
NEW DELHI, Scindia House. ☎45896
CALCUTTA, 17 Park Street. ☎240832

IRELAND – IRLANDE
Eason and Son, 40 Lower O'Connell Street,
P.O.B. 42, DUBLIN 1. ☎74 39 35

ISRAËL
Emanuel Brown: 35 Allenby Road, TEL AVIV. ☎51049/54082
also at:
9, Shlomzion Hamalka Street, JERUSALEM. ☎234807
48 Nahlath Benjamin Street, TEL AVIV. ☎53276

ITALY – ITALIE
Libreria Commissionaria Sansoni:
Via Lamarmora 45, 50121 FIRENZE. ☎579751
Via Bartolini 29, 20155 MILANO. ☎365083
Sous dépositaires :
Editrice e Libreria Herder,
Piazza Montecitorio 120, 00 186 ROMA ☎674628
Libreria Hoepli, Via Hoepli 5, 20121 MILANO. ☎365446
Libreria Lattes, Via Garibaldi 3, 10122 TORINO. ☎519274
La diffusione delle edizioni OCDE è inoltre assicurata dalle migliori

JAPAN – JAPON
OECD Publications Centre,
Akasaka Park Building, 2-3 4 Akasaka, Minato-ku,
TOKYO 107. ☎586-2016

KOREA – CORÉE
Pan Korea Book Corporation,
P.O.Box n°101 Kwangwhamun, SÉOUL. ☎72-7369

LEBANON – LIBAN
Documenta Scientifica/Redico,
Edison Building, Bliss Street, P.O.Box 5641, BEIRUT.
☎354429–344425

THE NETHERLANDS – PAYS-BAS
Staatsuitgeverij
Chr. Plantijnstraat
'S-GRAVENHAGE ☎ 070-814511
Voor bestellingen: ☎ 070-624551

NEW ZEALAND – NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE
The Publications Manager,
Government Printing Office,
WELLINGTON: Mulgrave Street (Private Bag),
World Trade Centre, Cubacade, Cuba Street,
Rutherford House, Lambton Quay, ☎737-320
AUCKLAND: Rutland Street (P.O.Box 5344), ☎32.919
CHRISTCHURCH: 130 Oxford Tce (Private Bag), ☎50.331
HAMILTON: Barton Street (P.O.Box 857), ☎80.103
DUNEDIN: T & G Building, Princes Street (P.O.Box 1104),
☎78.294

NORWAY – NORVÈGE
Johan Grundt Tanums Bokhandel,
Karl Johansgate 41/43, OSLO 1. ☎02-332980

PAKISTAN
Mirza Book Agency, 65 Shahrah Quaid-E-Azam, LAHORE 3.
☎66839

PHILIPPINES
R.M. Garcia Publishing House, 903 Quezon Blvd. Ext.,
QUEZON CITY, P.O.Box 1860 – MANILA. ☎99.98.47

PORTUGAL
Livraria Portugal, Rua do Carmo 70-74, LISBOA 2. ☎360582/3

SPAIN – ESPAGNE
Mundi Prensa Libros, S.A.
Castelló 37, Apartado 1223, MADRID-1. ☎275.46.55
Libreria Bastinos, Pelayo, 52, BARCELONA 1. ☎222.06.00

SWEDEN – SUÈDE
AB CE FRITZES KUNGL HOVBOKHANDEL,
Box 16 356, S 103 27 STH, Regeringsgatan 12,
DS STOCKHOLM. ☎08/23 89 00

SWITZERLAND – SUISSE
Librairie Payot, 6 rue Grenus, 1211 GENÈVE 11. ☎022-31.89.50

TAIWAN – FORMOSE
National Book Company,
84-5 Sing Sung Rd., Sec. 3, TAIPEI 107. ☎321.0698

TURKEY – TURQUIE
Librairie Hachette,
469 Istiklal Caddesi, Beyoglu, ISTANBUL. ☎44.94.70
et 14 E Ziya Gökalp Caddesi, ANKARA. ☎12.10.80

UNITED KINGDOM – ROYAUME-UNI
H.M. Stationery Office, P.O.B. 569,
LONDON SE1 9 NH. ☎01-928-6977, Ext.410
or
49 High Holborn, LONDON WC1V 6 HB (personal callers)
Branches at: EDINBURGH, BIRMINGHAM, BRISTOL,
MANCHESTER, CARDIFF, BELFAST.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
OECD Publications Center, Suite 1207, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave.,
N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C.20006. ☎(202)298-8755

VENEZUELA
Libreria del Este, Avda. F. Miranda 52, Edificio Galipán,
CARACAS 106. ☎32 23 01/33 26 04/33 24 73

YUGOSLAVIA – YOUGOSLAVIE
Jugoslovenska Knjiga, Terazije 27, P.O.B. 36, BEOGRAD.
☎621-992

Les commandes provenant de pays où l'OCDE n'a pas encore designé de depositaire peuvent être adressées à :
OCDE, Bureau des Publications, 2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16.
Orders and inquiries from countries where sales agents have not yet been appointed may be sent to:
OECD, Publications Office, 2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16.

PEB INFORMATION LEAFLETS

Issued by the OECD Programme on Educational Building (PEB), the leaflets aim at disseminating information on themes related to the activities of the Programme and on interesting examples of innovatory school building. They are particularly directed at administrators, local politicians, architects and educationists working in this field and it is hoped they will stimulate them in their search for new solutions to new problems. Leaflets are available in English and French. To ensure that future leaflets are related as closely as possible to the interests and pre-occupations of the readers, the Secretariat would welcome comments and suggestions for further topics. These, and also requests for additional copies of available leaflets, should be addressed directly to the PEB Secretariat, or alternatively, if from a participating country, to the national representative or correspondent to the Programme.

NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES AND/OR CORRESPONDENTS TO PEB

AUSTRALIA
Mr. R.A. FOSKETT
Department of Education
B.P. 826
WODEN, A.C.T. 2606

AUSTRIA
Mr. M. HINUM
Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kunst
Minoritenplatz 1
1014 VIENNA

BELGIUM
Mr. A. van BOGAERT
Fonds des Bâtiments scolaires
Ministère de l'Éducation nationale
28 rue J. de Lalaing
BRUSSELS B – 1040

DENMARK
Mr. P. LARSEN
Director
Byggedirektoratet
28 Nyropsgade
1602 COPENHAGUEN V

FINLAND
Mr. O. LAPPO
Helsinki University of Technology
OTANIEMI

FRANCE
Mr. G. LE MEUR
Direction des Équipements
Ministère de l'Éducation
142 rue du Bac
75357 PARIS

GREECE
Division for School
Construction Programmes
Ministry of Education
15 Mitropoleos Street
ATHENS

IRELAND
Mr. S. O'MAHONY
Building Unit
Department of Education
Marlborough Street
DUBLIN 1

ITALY
Mr. M. GUARINIERI-CANNIZZARO
Direttore di Centro di Studi
per l'Edilizia Scolastica
Piazza Marconi 25 – EUR
00144 ROME

NETHERLANDS
Mr. M.H.C. FAKKERT
School Building Department
Ministry of Education and Sciences
Riouwstraat 178
THE HAGUE

NEW ZEALAND
Mr. N.F. SUTTON
Department of Education
WELLINGTON

NORWAY
Mr. H. KVALVIK
Rådet För Videregående
Opplaering
Postboks 8170
OSLO Dep.

PORTUGAL
Mr. A.M. GONÇALVES
Direcção-Geral das Construçoes Escolares
Praça da Alvalade N° 11-2°
LISBON 5

SPAIN
Mr. J. CEBREIRO NUÑEZ
Subdirector Gral. de Contratacion
Ministério de Educación y Ciencia
Alfonso XII, 3 y 5
MADRID

SWEDEN
Mr. I. MATTSSON
Skolöverstyrelsen
Fack
S – 106 42 STOCKHOLM

SWITZERLAND
Mr. E. POGLIA
Office de la Science et de la Recherche
Département fédéral de l'Intérieur
B.P. 2732, CH – 3001 BERN

TURKEY
Mrs. G. ANDAÇ
Y. Mimar
Bayındırlık Bakanlığı
Yapı İsleri Genel Müdürlügü
ANKARA

UNITED KINGDOM
Mr. R.D. HORNE
Architects & Building Branch
Department of Education and Science
Elizabeth House, 39 York Road
LONDON SE1 7PH

YUGOSLAVIA
Mr. Z. BAJBUTOVIĆ
Office for School Building
M. Sokolovica 36
71000 SARAJEVO

PEB SECRETARIAT

Miss L. GIBSON	Principal Administrator
Mr. J. ADER	Professional Staff Member
Mrs. F. FRANCESCHI	Assistant Responsible for Documentation
Mrs. J. BARNOUX	Secretary
Mr. G. ODDIE	Senior Advisor

2, rue André-Pascal
75775 PARIS CEDEX 16
Tél: 524 9260